IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.Y.SOMAYAJULU**

**WRIT PETITION NOs: 23952 of 2003, 150 of 2004 and C.C.No.1604 of 2004**

**W.P.No.23952 of 2003:**

Between:

Nawab Khaja Moinuddin Khan, S/o. Late Ahmeduddin Khan,
R/o. Flat No.308, Shantinagar, Hyderabad.

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

-

1 The Vice Chairman and Managing Director, Hyderabad Urban Development Authority, Paigah Palace, Begumpet, Hyderabad.
2 Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi-ka-Pul, Hyderabad.
3 Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
4 Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar Revenue Mandal, R.R. District.
5 M/s. Silpa Real Estates (P) Ltd., rep. by its Managing Director
Mr. G. Gopal Reddy 6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
6 M/s. Silpa Real Estates & Resorts, rep. by its Managing Director
Mr. G. Gopal Reddy 6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
7 M/s. Silpa Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy
6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
8 Mr. S.C. Mohan Reddy S/o. S.K. Chenna Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
9 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy S/o. S.K. Chenna Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
10 Smt. S. Sreevani W/o. S. Pratap Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
11 M/s. Silpa Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy

6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad

12 M/s. Silpa Homes & Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Chakrapani Reddy Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency, Plot No. No.5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R. District.

13 M/s. Silpa Homes & Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency, Plot No. No.5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R. District.

14 M. Kesava Reddy S/o. M. Chenna Reddy
Flat No. 104, Sai Anusha Residence, Plot No.136, Rajeev Nagar, Borabunda, Hyderabad.

(RR 5to14 impleaded as per court order dt. 24-9-2004 in WPMP 14820 of 2004)

15 P. Nageswara Rao S/o. Prakash Rao
Sai Printers, Opp. Dwaraka Hotel, Lakdikapul, Hyderabad

16 P. Ramakoteswara Rao S/o. Prakash Rao
Sai Printers, Opp. Dwaraka Hotel, Lakdikapul, Hyderabad

(RR 15 & 16 impleaded as per court order dt. 16-12-2004 in WPMP 30134 of 2004)

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue orders, directions or Writ in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring that the action of the respondents in sanctioning lay-outs in Sy.No's.1 to 57 in an area of 8 Ac. situated at Shamshiguda Village, Balanagar Mandal, R.R.District, bearing Layout No.9427 M.P., HUDA/88 with Plot Nos. 1541 to 1753: (2) Layout No.1021/99 (3) 12470/MP2/84 HUDA; (4) 9427/MP/HUDA/88; (5) 10186/MP2 HUDA/92; (6) 3686/MP2/HUDA/97; (7) 286/MP2/HUDA/99; (8) 1031/MP2/H/99 in an area of 8 Ac. as illegal and unconstitutional.

**Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.C.PANDURANGA RAO**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR.B.Viswanatha Reddy**

**Counsel for the Respondents No.2 to 4: G.P. FOR REVENUE**

**Counsel for the Respondents 5 to 16: MR.P.SRI RAGHU RAM**

-

-

**WRIT PETITION NO : 150 of 2004**

-

Between:

Nawab Khaja Moinuddin Khan, S/o Late Ahmeduddin Khan,
R/o Flat No.308, Shanthinagar, Hyderabad.

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

-

1 The State of A.P. Rep. by Collector, Ranga Reddy District.
Lakdikapul, Hyderabad.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella Division, Rajendranagar,
Ranga Reddy District.
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer,
Balanagar, Ranga Reddy District.

**.....RESPONDENTS**

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to pass orders, positive directions or writ in the nature of Writ of Mandamus commanding the Respondents for correcting the ownership column and possessory column in respect of the immovable property lands Sy.Nos.1 to 57 an extent of 326 acres by correcting the name of Asmanjahi Paigah myself and other share holders situated at Maktha Shamshiguda Village, Balanagar Mandal, R.R.District in the revenue records of Maktha Shamshiguda Village.

**Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.C.PANDURANGA RAO**

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE**

**CONTEMPT CASE NO : 1604 of 2004**

-

Contempt Case U/s. 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act to punish the Respondents herein for violating, disobeying the Order of the High Court dated 16-12-2003 in WPMP No.30121 of 2003 in WP No.23952 of 2003.

Between:

Nawab Khaja Moinuddin Khan S/o Late Ahmeduddin Khan
R/o Flat No. 308, Shantinagar, Hyderabad.

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

-

1 Dr. B. Ashok Kumar
Hyderababd Urban Development Authority Paigah Palace,
Begumpet, Hyderabad.

2 Mr. Ravi Chandra
Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi Ka Pul,
Hyderabad.

3 Mr. Pandu Rangam,
Chewella Revenue Division, Rajendranagar,
R.R.Dist

4 Mr. Ratna Kumar
Balanagar (M), R.R.Dist.

5 Mr. G. Gopal Reddy,
M/s Silpa Real Estates (P) Ltd., 6-3-347/9/N,
N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

6 Mr. G. Gopal Reddy
M/s Silpa Estates & Resorts, 6-3-347/9/N,
N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

7 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy,
M/s Silpa Developers, 6-3-347/9/N,
N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

8 Mr. S.C. Mohan Reddy, S/o S.K. Chenna Reddy,
r/o Plot No. 40, Road No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony,
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.

9 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy, S/o S.K. Chenna Reddy,
R/o Plot No. 42, Road No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony,
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.

10 Smt. S. Sreevani W/o S. Pratap Reddy,
R/o Plot No. 42, Road No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony,
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.

11 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy,
M/s Silpa Developers, 6-3-347/9/N,
N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

12 S. Chakrapani,
M/s Silpa Homes & Developers, Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency,
Plot No. 5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R.Dist.

13 S. Pratap Reddy
M/s Silpa Homes & Developers, Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency,
Plot No. 5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R.Dist.

14 M. Kesava Reddy, S/o M. Chenna Reddy,
R/o Flat No. 104, Anusha Residency
Plot No. 16, Rejeev Nagar, Borabanda.

(Respondents 5 to 14 impleaded as per court order dated 24-09-2004 in W.P.M.P.No.14820 of 2004)

**.....RESPONDENTS**

**Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.C.PANDURANGA RAO**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Standing Counsel for HUDA**

**Counsel for the Respondents No.2 to 4: GP FOR REVENUE**

**The Court made the following:**

-

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.Y.SOMAYAJULU**

**W.P.Nos.23952 OF 2003, 150 OF 2004**

**AND**

**C.C.NO.1604 OF 2004**

**COMMON ORDER:**

Since these petitions are interconnected, they are being disposed of by a common order.

(2) W.P.No.23952 of 2003 is filed questioning layouts in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda village, Balanagar Mandal, R.R.District sanctioned by the Vice Chairman and Managing Director, Hyderabad Urban Development Authority (HUDA) (first respondent). While admitting the writ petition, a learned single Judge of this Court in W.P.M.P.No.30121 of 2003 filed in that writ petition gave a direction to the respondents not to grant any pattas in respect of the lands covered by Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda village till further orders. Alleging that respondents violated the said interim order dated 16-12-2003 in W.P.M.P.No.30121 of 2003, petitioner filed C.C.No.1604 of 2004. W.P.No.150 of 2004 is filed by the petitioner in W.P.No.23952 of 2003 seeking a direction to the respondents i.e., State of Andhra Pradesh represented by Collector, Revenue Divisional Officer and Mandal Revenue Officer to correct the ownership column and possessory column in respect of the lands in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 to an extent of Acs.326-00 of Shamshiguda village in the revenue records.

(3) The case, in brief, of the petitioner, is that he and others are legal heirs to the estate of Nawab Ahmeduddin Khan who was shown as 6th defendant in C.S.No.7 of 1958 on the file of this
Court and that in pursuance to the Compromise Decree, dated
06-04-1959 passed in that suit, lands to an extent of Acs.326.00 gts in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda were allotted to defendants
2 to 12 and 14 to 22 in that suit, and thereafter, by virtue of the order dated 02-02-2000 in Application No.73 of 2000 in C.S.No.7 of 1958, he and others were recognized as the successors of the 6th defendant, and so he is filing this writ petition on behalf of all the heirs of Ahmeduddin Khan, since he came to know that

first respondent sanctioned layout in respect of Acs.8.00 in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda in the name of 3rd parties.

(4) According to petitioner, Acs.326.00 in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 shown as item No.252 in C.S.No.7 of 1958 was purchased by Asman Jahi Paigah and that the Government, after following the procedure prescribed, declared that land as the private property of Asman Jahi Paigah and so he made a representation to the Government to clarify the ownership of Asman Jahi Paigah in respect of the said land, and the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, under the instructions of the Government, issued a clarification on

01-10-2003 clarifying that the above said land is the property of Asman Jahi Paigah and so the layout sanctioned by the first respondent, without notice to him and other share holders, and without keeping in view the decree in C.S.No.7 of 1958, is unsustainable, and the land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda which is registered as Government land in the revenue records, may be corrected as patta land and his name and the name of other heirs may be mutated in the revenue register.

(5) In W.P.No.23592 of 2003, first respondent filed his counter affidavit, alleging that since the land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda is shown as Government land in the revenue records, and since he is not a party to C.S.No.7 of 1958, on an application by the Collector, for weaker section layouts therein, after obtaining the technical approval only the layout would be released. Thereafter the concerned Mandal Revenue Officer or District Collector will take necessary action for demarcation of the plots on ground and would allot plots to weaker sections of society, and HUDA would not verify the ownership aspect in weaker sections layout sanction, sought by the District Collector/Mandal Revenue Officer and that aspect would be looked into by them i.e., District Collector/Mandal Revenue Officer.

(6) Third parties, who claim interest in the land over which title is being claimed by the petitioner, filed W.P.M.P.No.14820 of 2004 to implead them as respondents 5 to 14 and were permitted to come on record as respondents 5 to 14. Their contention is that they purchased parts of land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 from private parties under registered sale deeds and that the Special Court under the Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act, by its judgment dated 15-12-1994 in L.G.C.No.106 of 1989 held that Acs.274.33 guntas in Sy.No.57 Samshiguda Village, is Government land and that respondents therein, who claimed themselves the heirs to the estate of Mohammad Moinuddowala Bahadur, father of Mohammed Bahabhuddin khan, who is the first respondent in the said LGC, petitioner cannot be granted any relief in this petition as there are disputed questions of fact and law.

(7) The main contention of the learned counsel for petitioner is that since land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda village was the subject matter of C.S. No.7 of 1958 on the file of this Court and since the said land, along with other land, was allotted to the ancestor of the petitioner, the same is a private land and so the petitioner and other heirs are entitled to the declaration sought.

He relied on Sections 5 and 18 of Jagir Abolition Regulation, 1348 Fasli, Section 59 of the A.P. (T.A.) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, Section 8 & 18 of the A.P. Urban Areas (Development) Act, 1975 and the Decree dated 06-04-1959 in C.S.No.7 of 1958 and contended that since competent authority declared the disputed property as the private property of the Jagirdar, the ancestor of the petitioner, and since in **GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH v. TULSIRAM ,** it is held that a dispute whether the land forms part of jagir or is a private land can be decided only by the jagir administrator, and the Government, exercising its administrative powers, cannot decide the same, he contended that there can be no impediment to grant the reliefs sought by the petitioner in view of the voluminous documentary evidence produced by the petitioner. Relying on **MEER AHMED ALI KHAN v. MOMEN BEGUM** , where it is held that a Collector or Talukdar cannot go behind the decree

or order of a civil Court and revise any entry in the record of rights as against the decision of the civil Court which became final, he contends that Government which is a party to C.S.No.7 of 1958 is estopped from claiming title to the property in question. Relying on **SRI BHEEMESWARASWAMI TEMPLE P. v. SATYANARAYANA** , **JATTU RAM v. HAKAM SINGH** he contended that mere entries in the revenue record do not establish title and since the decree in C.S.No.7 of 1958 operates as Res Judicata, he relying on **BHANU KUMAR JAIN v. ARCHANA KUMAR & ANR., SYED IMDAD ALI QUADRI v. STATE OF A.P.** . Relying on **VICE-CHAIRMAN, HUDA v. DIAMOND HILLS WELFARE ASSOCIATION ,** contended that since layout cannot be sanctioned to a person who has no title to the land, first respondent erred in sanctioning a layout without verifying the title of the Government and contended that since the Government did not file counter, the petition has to be allowed applying the rule of non-traverse, as held in **RAMESH KUMAR v. KESHO RAM .** He contended that since this Court in **K.VEERAIAH v. N. VENKATESWARLU ,** held that while punishing the contemnors, court can also grant the consequential relief of restoration of possession of land, petitioner is also is entitled to the relief of recovery of possession of land. Relying on **THOTA MALLIKHARJUNA RAO v. M.N. PURNACHANDRA RAO** , **E.T. SUNUP v. C.A.N.S.S. EMPLOYEES ASSOCN.** and **P.G. PATRA v. PURAN FOODS** , he contended that persons who are not parties to suit also can be punished and so the respondents who occupied the lands of the petitioner, are liable for punishment for contempt. Relying on **R. KANAKAMMA v. DIST. COLLECTOR NELLORE** , he contended that Government taking forcible possession of the land of petitioner and the other heirs of the original owner and assigning it to others violates Article 300-A, Article 31 A and Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Relying on **M.LACHAIAH & OTHERS v. NAJEEZUNNISSA BEGUM & ANOTHER ,** he contended that since collector has power to rectify the entries in the Record of Rights and since correction of entries without issuing notice to affected parties is bad, as held in **K.B. SURENDRA KUMAR v. SPECIAL OFFICER,**

**URBAN LAND CEILING** , title of the petitioner and his coheirs in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda may be declared and respondents may be evicted and petitioner and his coheirs may be put in possession thereof and consequently the entries in the revenue records may be directed to be corrected, and the respondent may be punished for contempt of court for violating the order of this Court in W.P.M.P.No.30121 of 2003.

(8) The contention of the learned Standing counsel for the first respondent is that since the land in Sy.No.57 is registered as Government land in the revenue records, and in cases of Government land when the Concerned revenue officials apply for a layout for weaker sections of society, the same would be granted, and so by approving a layout for weaker sections of society on an application by the collector for that purpose, first respondent did not commit any error and so petitioner is not entitled to any relief from the first respondent and since first respondent did not issue any pattas, he did not commit any contempt.

(9) The contention of the learned Government Pleader is that since disputed questions of fact and law are involved in this case, no relief can be granted to the petitioner by this Court exercising its writ jurisdiction, that too after the Special Court established under the A.P. Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act, 1982 held that the land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda is Government land, by negativing the contention of the respondents therein that that land in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 is their private patta land, and in any event since all the legal heirs of the Asman Jahi Paigah are not before this Court, petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

(10) The two writ petitions are liable to be dismissed *in limine* because it is well known that a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution can be filed to enforce a right but not for ‘establishment of a right’. Impliedly the relief sought in these petitions is the declaration of the title of the petitioner and others to Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda village and consequential relief of possession. For such relief,

petitioner has to file a civil suit but not a writ petition, because there is nothing on record to show that the lands in Sy.Nos.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda Village are covered by C.S.No.7 of 1958 or to show that those lands were allotted exclusively to the predecessor of the petitioner and since the fact that the Special Court under the A.P. Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act, in L.G.C.No.106 of 1989 held that land in Sy.No.57 of Shamshiguda is Government land is not denied or disputed. As per Section 8 (6) of the A.P. Land Grabbing (Prevention) Act, every judgment of Special Court, with regard to determination of title and ownership to, or lawful possession of, any land grabbed shall be binding on "all persons having interest in such land". In view thereof, prima facie the judgment of the Special Court in L.G.C.No.106 of 1989 declaring the title of the Government of A.P. in respect of Acs.227.19 gts in Sy.No.57 of Shamshiguda, the contention of petitioner that he and his coheirs are the owners of the entire extent of land in Sy.No.1 to 57 of Shamshiguda cannot be accepted.

(10) The contention of the petitioner that since Government is a party to C.S.No.7 of 1958, the decree therein is binding on the Government cannot be accepted, because the cause title in C.S.No.7 of 1958 does not show that Government of Andhra Pradesh is a party to that suit. In that suit 'Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh' is made a party. The contention of the learned petitioner that since the Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Andhra pradesh is a party, Government should be deemed to be a party cannot be accepted. The fact that Secretary to Government can represent the Government does not mean that if the Secretary to Government is made a party, the decree against him would bind the Government. If at all the decree can bind only the Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh, but not the Government of Andhra Pradesh. For a decree or order to be binding on the Government, the description should be 'Government of Andhra Pradesh represented either by collector or the concerned Secretary to Government'. If the description is 'Secretary to Government

of Andhra Pradesh', it would be deemed to be a suit or proceeding against that Secretary only, but not against the Government. For example, if the principal is sued through his agent, the suit should be against the principal represented by the agent. If the agent is made a party, it would be a suit against the agent only but not against the principal. All that apart Secretary, Finance Department has nothing to do with the lands administration. Secretary, Revenue Department would be the concerned Secretary, as he would have control over the relevant records relating to the land. So, prima facie, the contention that since Government is party to C.S.No.7 of 1958, it is bound by the decree,s cannot be accepted.

(11) All these apart who are the other coheirs of the petitioner is not known. How the petitioner is connected with and how many legal heirs Nawab Ahmeduddin Khan, the 6th defendant in C.S.No.7 of 1958, left behind and when he died is not mentioned in the affidavits filed in support of these petitions. In the above circumstances, and since admittedly petitioner is not in possession of and is claiming the relief of recovery of possession, the only remedy of the petitioner is to approach Civil court.

(12) For correction of entries in the revenue records, petitioner has to follow the procedure prescribed in the concerned statute or has to file a civil suit. He cannot file a writ for that relief without first moving the concerned revenue officials. Petitioner who is claiming title to and possession of more than Acs.326.00 of land did not state whether he filed declaration either under the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 or under Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 and the results thereof. As an individual, he cannot hold an extent of Acs.326.00 either vacant or agricultural land, in view of the above said enactments. Therefore, question of mutating the name of the petitioner to such an extent of land, on the mere assertions made by the petitioner, does not arise. Hence, both the writ

petitions have no merit.

(13) With regard to Contempt Case, the interim order is, “not to issue patta”. It is not the case of the petitioner that any of the respondents had issued patta in favour of anybody, after the said interim order was passed. Therefore, none of the respondents can be said to have violated the interim orders passed by this Court. So the contempt case deserves dismissal.

(14) In the result, all the petitions are dismissed with costs. Advocate fees is fixed at Rs.500/- in each petition.

_____

**C.Y.SOMAYAJULU, J**

Date: 21-04-2005

YCR

To

1 The Vice Chairman and Managing Director, Hyderabad Urban Development Authority, Paigah Palace, Begumpet, Hyderabad.
2 The Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi-ka-Pul, Hyderabad.
3 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
4 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar Revenue Mandal, R.R. District.
5. 2 CCs to G.P. for Revenue, High court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)

6. 2 C.D. copies.

7 M/s. Silpa Real Estates (P) Ltd., rep. by its Managing Director
Mr. G. Gopal Reddy 6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
8 M/s. Silpa Real Estates & Resorts, rep. by its Managing Director
Mr. G. Gopal Reddy 6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad

9 M/s. Silpa Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy
6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
10 Mr. S.C. Mohan Reddy S/o. S.K. Chenna Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
11 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy S/o. S.K. Chenna Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
12 Smt. S. Sreevani W/o. S. Pratap Reddy
Plot No. 40, Rd. No. 14, B.N. Reddy Colony, Bunjara Hills, Hyderabad
13 M/s. Silpa Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy
6-3-347/9/N, NV Plaza, 3rd floor, Dwarakapuri Colony, Punjagutta, Hyderabad
14 M/s. Silpa Homes & Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Chakrapani Reddy Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency, Plot No. No.5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R. District.
15 M/s. Silpa Homes & Developers, rep. by its Managing Partner S. Pratap Reddy
Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency, Plot No. No.5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R. District.

16 M. Kesava Reddy S/o. M. Chenna Reddy
Flat No. 104, Sai Anusha Residence, Plot No.136, Rajeev Nagar, Borabunda, Hyderabad.

17 Dr. B. Ashok Kumar
Hyderababd Urban Development Authority Paigah Palace,
Begumpet, Hyderabad.
18 Mr. Ravi Chandra
Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi Ka Pul,
Hyderabad.
19 Mr. Pandu Rangam,
Chewella Revenue Division, Rajendranagar,
R.R.Dist
20 Mr. Ratna Kumar
Balanagar (M), R.R.Dist.
21 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy,
M/s Silpa Developers, 6-3-347/9/N,

N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

22 Mr. S. Pratap Reddy,
M/s Silpa Developers, 6-3-347/9/N,
N.V. Plaza, 3rd Floor, Dwarkapuri Colony, Panjagutta, Hyderabad.

23 S. Chakrapani,
M/s Silpa Homes & Developers, Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency,
Plot No. 5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R.Dist.

24 S. Pratap Reddy
M/s Silpa Homes & Developers, Flat No. 102, Silpa Residency,
Plot No. 5, Silpa Park, Kondapur, R.R.Dist.

25 M. Kesava Reddy, S/o M. Chenna Reddy,
R/o Flat No. 104, Anusha Residency
Plot No. 16, Rejeev Nagar, Borabanda.